

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph but are otherwise allowable. Claims 21, 22, 24, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claims 23, 26, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 14-20 have been allowed. Claim 25 is objected to but otherwise allowable. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. Claim 25 has been canceled without prejudice.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

OBJECTIONS TO THE FIGURES UNDER 37 CFR 1.83(a) AND 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to show an optical member holding both the convex mirror and the imaging device without using a separate housing. The structural feature is shown in FIG. 3B and claim 1 has been amended to recite that, the optical member holds both the convex mirror and the lens of the imaging mechanism. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the ground for objection is moot and that no amendments to the drawings are required.

The Examiner, further, has objected to claims 1-13 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that, the optical member holds both the convex mirror and the lens of the imaging mechanism. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the grounds for objection are moot. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 1-13 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 112, first paragraph. As such, the Applicants believe that claims 1-13 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 21, 22, 24, 28, and 29 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,426,774 to Driscoll ("Driscoll" or the "Driscoll Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments and for the reasons detailed below.

The Examiner admits that the Driscoll and the other references do not disclose the recitations in claim 25. Claim 21 has been amended to include these recitations. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that the grounds for rejection are moot. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, claims 21, 22, 24, 28, and 29 are not anticipated or made obvious by Driscoll and, further, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 102(e). As such, the Applicants believe that the claims are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,745,286 to Hawryluk ("Hawryluk" or the "Hawryluk Reference"); claims 26 and 27 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll; and claim 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driscoll in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,169,637 to Tsunashima ("Tsunashima" or the "Tsunashima Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments and for reasons detailed below.

Claims 26 and 27

For the reasons provided above and by the Examiner's admission, claim 21 as amended herein is not made obvious by the Driscoll reference and therefore all claims depending therefrom similarly are not made obvious. Thus, it is respectfully

submitted that, claims 26 and 27 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a), and are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 23

For the reasons provided above and by the Examiner's admission, claim 21 as amended herein is not made obvious by the Driscoll reference and therefore all claims depending therefrom similarly are not made obvious. The Hawryluk reference for an aspheric optical element cannot make up for the deficiencies of the Driscoll reference. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 23 is not made obvious by Driscoll in view of Hawryluk and, further, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 23 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

Claim 30

For the reasons provided above and by the Examiner's admission, claim 21 as amended herein is not made obvious by the Driscoll reference and therefore all claims depending therefrom similarly are not made obvious. The Tsunashima reference for a catadioptric lens cannot make up for the deficiencies of the Driscoll reference. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that, claim 30 is not made obvious by Driscoll in view of Tsunashima and, further, satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 103(a). As such, the Applicants believe that claim 30 is allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason the fee paid is inadequate or credit is


A. Kuriyama, et al.
USSN: 10/068,146
Page 12

owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge
Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 1, 2004

By:


George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicants

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 517-5523
Customer No. 21874
439269